

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

I. Title of the Invention

In accordance with Examiner's request, the title of the invention has been amended. The invention is now titled "A UI DISPLAY APPARATUS AND METHOD FOR DISPLAYING, ON A SCREEN, AN ICON REPRESENTING A DEVICE CONNECTED TO A NETWORK."

II. Amendments to the Specification and Abstract

The specification and abstract have been reviewed and revised to improve their English grammar, as well as address the informalities identified in the objection on pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action. Therefore, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

The amendments to the specification and abstract have been incorporated into a substitute specification and abstract. Attached are two versions of the substitute specification and abstract, a marked-up version showing the revisions, as well as a clean version. No new matter has been added.

III. Informalities

Claims 1 and 9 were objected to for reciting "an other." Claims 1 and 9 have been amended to replace the term "an other" with the term "another," as suggested by the Examiner. As a result, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

IV. Amendments to the Claims

Claims 2, 3, 10, 11 and 17 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein.

Further, claims 1, 9 and 18 have been amended to clarify features of the invention recited therein and to further distinguish the present invention from the references relied upon in the rejections discussed below.

It is also noted that claims 1, 4-9, 12-16 and 18 have been amended to make a number of editorial revisions thereto. These editorial revisions have been made to place the claims in better U.S. form. Further, these editorial revisions have not been made to narrow the scope of protection of the claims, or to address issues related to patentability, and therefore, these amendments should not be construed as limiting the scope of equivalents of the claimed features offered by the Doctrine of Equivalents.

V. 35 U.S.C. §101 Rejections

Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 for failure to recite statutory subject matter. As mentioned above, claim 17 has been cancelled. As a result, withdrawal of this rejection of claim 17 is respectfully requested.

Further, claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 for failing to recite that the storage medium is a non-transitory storage medium. As a result, claim 18 has been amended to recite “a non-transitory computer-readable recording medium having a program stored thereon.” As a result, claim 18 now recites statutory subject matter and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

VI. 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph Rejection

Claim 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, this rejection states that claim 18 recites “program and/or data” which is indefinite.

Claim 18 has been amended to recite “program,” rather than “program and/or data.” As a result, claim 18 no longer recites the limitation identified as being indefinite. Therefore, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

VII. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Claims 1-3, 5-11 and 13-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Beecroft (U.S. 6,760,415), Choi (U.S. 2004/0150546) and Takahashi (EP 1 028 368). Further, claims 4 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Beecroft, Choi, Takahashi, and Castaldi (U.S. 2005/0005109). These rejections believed clearly inapplicable to amended independent claims 1 and 9 and the claims that depend therefrom for the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 1 recites a display apparatus including a display unit operable to display device-related information (related to a device connected to a network), when a judgment unit judges that the device-related information is identified in display judgment information (recorded in a recording unit of the display apparatus and indicating whether information should be displayed on a screen). Further, claim 1 recites that the device-related information is in a hierarchical format, and recites that the display judgment information includes, in a hierarchical format, (i) pieces of device type information, each piece of the device

type information identifying a type of a device connected to the network, and (ii) pieces of device information, each piece of the device information identifying information about the device for which the type is identified by a corresponding piece of the device type information.

In addition, claim 1 recites that the judgment unit repeats the judgment on the device-type information and the display judgment information having the hierarchical format, starting from a higher layer of the hierarchical format of the display judgment information and continuing to a lower layer of the hierarchical format of the display judgment information. Finally, claim 1 recites that the display unit changes an icon displayed thereon corresponding to the device-related information, the icon being displayed in association with a layer of the device-related information in the hierarchical format judged, by the judgment unit, as being identified in the display judgment information.

Initially, please note that the above-described 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection relies on (i) Figs. 2 and 3 and col. 5, lines 14-55 of Beecroft, (ii) Fig. 2 and paragraphs [0031]-[0034] of Choi, and (iii) Fig. 17 and paragraph [0068] of Takahashi for teaching the features of the display judgment information recorded in the recording unit and the device-related information obtained by the obtainment unit, as recited in previously presented claims 2 and 3 (see pages 11 and 12 of Office Action). However, in view of the above-identified amendments to claim 1, which clarify the structure of the display judgment information and the device-related information, it is submitted that any combination of Beecroft, Choi and Takahashi fails to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned distinguishing features now required by amended independent claim 1.

Rather, Figs. 2 and 3 and col. 5, lines 14-55 of Beecroft merely disclose that caller ID information and answer, ignore flash, mute and hold options are presented/available to a viewer, when the viewer receives a telephone call while watching television.

Thus, in view of the above, even though Beecroft teaches that various services are presented/available to a user when a telephone call is received while the user is watching television, Beecroft still fails to disclose or suggest that the device-related information is in a hierarchical format, and that the display judgment information includes, in a hierarchical format, (i) pieces of device type information, each piece of the device type information identifying a type of a device connected to the network, and (ii) pieces of device information, each piece of the device information identifying information about the device for which the type is identified by a corresponding piece of the device type information, as recited in claim 1.

Now turning to the Choi reference, the Applicants note that Fig. 2 and paragraphs [0031]-[0034] of Choi merely disclose a storage/recording unit 224 that matches remote control service list information (i.e., functions of wired and wireless communication devices) to corresponding remote controls (see paragraph [0033]).

Thus, in view of the above, it is clear that Choi teaches matching remote control services with corresponding remote controls, but fails to disclose or suggest that the device-related information is in a hierarchical format, and that the display judgment information includes, in a hierarchical format, (i) pieces of device type information, each piece of the device type information identifying a type of a device connected to the network, and (ii) pieces of device information, each piece of the device information identifying information about the device for which the type is identified by a corresponding piece of the device type information, as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, regarding the Takahashi reference, the Applicants note that Fig. 17 and paragraph [0068] of Takahashi merely teach storing/presenting information of multiple printers in a table format.

As such, it is apparent that Takahashi teaches that information regarding devices is stored/presented in a table format, but fails to disclose or suggest that the device-related information is in a hierarchical format, and that the display judgment information includes, in a hierarchical format, (i) pieces of device type information, each piece of the device type information identifying a type of a device connected to the network, and (ii) pieces of device information, each piece of the device information identifying information about the device for which the type is identified by a corresponding piece of the device type information, as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, because Beecroft, Choi and Takahashi fail to disclose or suggest the hierarchical structure of the device-related information and the display judgment information, any combination of Beecroft, Choi and Takahashi also fails to disclose or suggest (i) repeating the judgment on the device-type information and the display judgment information having the hierarchical format, starting from a higher layer of the hierarchical format of the display judgment information and continuing to a lower layer of the hierarchical format of the display judgment information, and (ii) changing an icon displayed thereon corresponding to the device-related information, the icon being displayed in association with a layer of the device-related information in the hierarchical format judged, by the judgment unit, as being identified in the display judgment information, as required by claim 1.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that claim 1 and claims 4-8 that depend therefrom would not have been obvious or result from any combination of Beecroft, Choi and Takahashi.

Please note that one of the benefits of the structure required by claim 1 is that, by simply looking at the displayed icon, a user can immediately know up to which layer of the hierarchical

display judgment information the obtained device-related information matches, which produces an advantageous effect that the user can instantly be aware of whether or not the device displayed by the UI display apparatus is a desired device. In light of the discussion above, the combination of Beecroft, Choi and Takahashi does not provide the above-mentioned benefits of the structure required by claim 1, because Beecroft, Choi and Takahashi fails to disclose or suggest (i) the hierarchical structure of the device-related information and the display judgment information, (ii) repeating the judgment on the device-type information and the display judgment information having the hierarchical format, starting from a higher layer of the hierarchical format of the display judgment information and continuing to a lower layer of the hierarchical format of the display judgment information, and (iii) changing an icon displayed thereon corresponding to the device-related information, the icon being displayed in association with a layer of the device-related information in the hierarchical format and judged by the judgment unit as being identified in the display judgment information, as required by claim 1.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Beecroft, Choi and/or Takahashi or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Beecroft, Choi and/or Takahashi to obtain the invention of independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 and claims 4-8 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

Amended independent claim 9 is directed to a method and recites features that correspond to the above-mentioned distinguishing features of independent claim 1. Thus, for the same reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 9 and claims 12-18 that depend therefrom are allowable over the prior art of record.

Regarding dependent claims 4 and 12, which were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beecroft, Choi and Takahashi (primary and secondary references) in view of Castaldi (tertiary reference), it is respectfully submitted that this tertiary reference does not disclose or suggest the above-discussed features of independent claims 1 and 9 which are lacking from the primary and secondary references. Therefore, no obvious combination of Castaldi with any of the primary and secondary references would result in, or otherwise render obvious, the invention recited independent claims 1 and 9 and claims 4-8, 12-16 and 18 that depend therefrom.

VIII. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Naonori KATO et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/

By 2010.07.20 14:08:31 -04'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap
Registration No. 60,554
Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
July 20, 2010